

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars.

1. Rejection of claims 10-12 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. pat. no. 1,932,153 (*Bergendahl*)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the basis that the *Bergendahl* patent fails to disclose each and every element of claims 10-12 and 15.

By way of review, claim 10 recites a device for binding a quire having a table and at least one cutting means. The table includes a bowed portion adjacent to a recess that has a shape corresponding to the contour form of the cut to be formed, such that the sheets of the quire are at least partly rolled up when placed on the table. Additionally, a generally U-shaped stop is placed within the bowed portion to receive a folded edge of the quire.

It is respectfully submitted that the *Bergendahl* patent fails to disclose at least a U-shaped stop within the bowed portion to receive a folded edge of the quire.

The *Bergendahl* patent discloses placing a block on a table 9 and bending a rear part of the block downwards over a rounded edge 7 of the table (page 1, lines 58-67). This bending occurs by the rear part of the block being gripped by jaws 4 (page 1, lines 65-67). However, it is respectfully submitted that the *Bergendahl* patent does not disclose a U-shaped stop within a bowed portion of the table that receives the folded edge of the quire.

At most, as the Office action dated September 9, 2010 on page 2 states, the *Bergendahl* patent discloses jaws 4 that hold the rear end of the block when bending the end of the block downwards over the rounded edge of the table.

It is respectfully submitted that the jaws as disclosed in the *Bergendahl* patent does not correspond or disclose the same structure as the features as recited in claim 10,

specifically, a U-shaped stop placed within a bowed portion of the table. The U-shaped stop allows the sheets of the quire to be partly rolled up, such that the successive sheets 12 are shifted in relation to each other (*pending specification* page 6, lines 14-19). Whereas, the jaws of the *Bergendahl* patent are used to grip the rear part of the block (page 1, lines 65-67).

Since the *Bergendahl* patent does not disclose at least a U-shaped stop placed within a bowed portion of the table, the *Bergendahl* patent does not disclose each and every element of claim 10.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

As mentioned above, applicant submits that independent claim 10 is patentable and therefore, claims 11-12 and 15, which depend from claim 10, are also considered to be patentable as containing all of the elements of claim 10, as well as for their respective recited features.

2. Rejection of claims 1-6, 8, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. pat. no. 4,364,737 (*Sowden*) in view of U.S. pat. no. 4,833,958 (*Abildgaard et al.*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested on the basis that the rejection fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1, from which claims 2-6, 8, and 9 depend.

By way of review, claim 1 recites a method for binding a quire formed of folded sheets. This binding method includes providing a quire and partly rolling up the quire along the folding edge. The method also includes providing at least one cut through the sheets of the quire as of a short distance from the folding edge of the quire, where the lip has a widening.

As the specification discloses, the steps as recited in claim 1 allow a cut to be provided in the different sheets of the quire, where the position of the cuts through the

successive sheets is removed further away from the folding edge. This allows the widenings of the different lips to mesh further under the side edges of the cut in the back sheet (page 6, lines 7-13).

It is respectfully submitted that the proposed combination of the *Sowden* and *Abildgaard* patents fails to disclose or suggest at least partly rolling up the quire along the folding edge and providing at least one cut through the sheets of the quire as recited in claim 1.

The *Sowden* patent discloses connecting a substantial number of loose sheets by folding over the corner and punching the sheets (column 1, lines 49-68). The sheets of paper are placed one on top of the other and fed into a guide, which has a shape to eventually prevent the sheets of paper from being fed any further forward (column 3, lines 41-59). Then a punching head is brought down onto the anvil and the folded over sheets are then punched to have T-shaped portions (column 3, lines 41-59).

Although the Office action on page 4 suggests that the *Sowden* patent discloses providing a cut slantingly in relation to the surface of the quire, it is respectfully submitted that shank extension 41a is provided to allow the punch to punch out a key-hole shaped piece but leaves attached the remainder of the material (column 4, lines 56-62). In other words, the shank extension 41a is used to prevent the punch from punching completely through the quire.

Similarly, the *Abildgaard* patent discloses punching holes in sheets of mixed thicknesses or sheets folded into signatures along a marginal edge (column 3, lines 4-6). One of the important features of the invention disclosed in the *Abildgaard* patent is that the “punch reciprocates horizontally and the sheets being punched are disposed substantially vertically as contrasted with common motor-driven punches wherein the paper is horizontal” (column 7, lines 42-51).

From the teachings disclosed in the *Sowden* and *Abildgaard* patents, it is respectfully submitted that one having ordinary skill in the art would not be led to a

method having the step of partly rolling up the quire along the folding edge as recited in claim 1.

At most, as the Office action on page 4 suggests, the proposed combination of the *Sowden* and *Abildgaard* patents would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to a method for binding a stack of folded sheets. However, it is respectfully submitted that one having ordinary skill in the art would not then modify the invention disclosed in the *Sowden* patent with the teachings in the *Abildgaard* patent to partly roll up the quire along the folding edge, as recited in claim 1. In fact, there is no suggestion in either of the *Sowden* or *Abildgaard* patents of the advantages of rolling up the quire along the folding edge before punching.

It is respectfully submitted that partly rolling up the quire along the folding edge, as recited in claim 1, allows the successive sheets to shift in relation to each other (page 6, lines 14-24). After providing a cut crosswise on the surface of the quire, the widening of the different lips created during the cut can mesh further under the side edges of the cut in the back sheet (page 6, lines 6-13).

Accordingly, the proposed combination of the *Sowden* and *Abildgaard* patents fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1, from which claims 2-6, 8 and 9 depend, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

3. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that every pending claim in the present application be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

Please charge any additional fees required or credit any overpayments in connection with this paper to Deposit Account No. 02-0200.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the applicant's attorney, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

Date: December 9, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/Patrick M. Buechner/

PATRICK M. BUECHNER
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 57,504